

**INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL  
COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES**

**COMMITTEE:** Public Awareness Committee

**RECORDER:** Elissa Provance, WestEd CPEI      **DATE:** 9-22-05

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:** Elaine Schneider, Kathleen Colvin, Shirley Stihler,  
Stephanie Pringle Fox, Toni Doman, Cynthia Jaynes

**ABSENT:** Hedy Hansen, Zelna Banks, Thomas McCool, Nenita  
Herrera-Sioco, Cal Enriquez

**GUESTS:** None

**LIAISON:** Janet Canning (CDE), Carmen Harms (DDS)

**MEETING NOTES**

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Elaine Schneider at 1:40 pm. Elaine informed PAC members that the DDS Liaison, Pat Widmann, was reassigned to the Integrated Services and Health Committee and then introduced Carmen Harms from DDS who will serve as PAC's new DDS Liaison. Elaine also informed the committee that Hedy Hansen, PAC's Co-Chair and ICC Co-Chair, submitted a letter of resignation to ICC Chair Dr. Mac Peterson. Committee members provided introductions.

**II. AGENDA REVIEW**

Agenda was reviewed and no changes noted.

**III. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

PAC May 2005 minutes were reviewed and approved with one change per Janet Canning. Under Item 9, the date for statewide dissemination of the Reasons for Concern brochure should be changed from December 2005 to January 2006.

**IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Elaine reviewed the *Part C Indicators—State Performance Report* worksheet distributed at the Executive Committee meeting. Per Rick Ingraham, Part C Coordinator, these OSEP indicators must be addressed in the six-year State Performance Plan due December 1. The State Performance Plan is a forecasting of actions to be taken by states to meet the federal requirements and is focused on child and family outcomes. This differs from the Annual Performance Plan, which was more process

oriented and reported on past performance. The Executive Committee assigned specific ICC committees to address each indicator. PAC was assigned two indicators related to child find (see Item 10 below).

V. UPDATE ON JUNE 8, 05 INTERIM MEETING/REVIEW OF FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Elaine reported that the Executive Committee would be submitting an Action Item and Recommendation to the full ICC on September 23, 2005. The recommendation is for the ICC to approve the *ICC Priorities, Outcomes and Recommendations to the Department of Developmental Services*, which outlines 33 recommendations, developed over the past two and a half years that address the four priority areas of the ICC:

- Early Entry
- Individualized Family Service Plan
- Transition
- Interagency Collaboration

VI. IDENTIFICATION OF NEXT STEPS TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Elaine reported that DDS will respond to the recommendations cited in Item 5 and a strategic planning session will be held in January to address the implementation of the recommendations.

VII. REVIEW OF PAC WORK PLAN

PAC members reviewed the Work Plan and all items have been completed.

VIII. UPDATE ON THE PARENT LEADERSHIP AWARD CRITERIA

PAC members reviewed the Parent Leadership Award Criteria with assistance from Cheri Schoenborn, ICC Staff Manager. The recipient of this award will represent California at the annual National Early Childhood Education Conference in conjunction with the Infant Toddler Coordinator Association. PAC was charged with developing the nominating criteria and a process for selecting nominees to submit to the Executive Committee for a final decision.

*Selection Criteria*

In addition to the criteria discussed in May, Elissa Provance, staff to PAC, will complete a section entitled "Purpose." This information will precede the Selection Criteria information on the nomination form.

A selection criterion includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Extraordinary personal effort
- Substantial contribution to the field of early intervention
- Enhanced the quality of services
- Increased access and awareness of services
- Served in a mentorship capacity
- Promoted family centeredness

- Empowered families
- Served as an advocate
- Showed outstanding leadership
- Represented the family voice at the local state, and national levels
- Represented individual needs of their community
- PAC members created a rubric based on this criterion to quantify and evaluate nominees.

*Selection Process*

Nominees must submit

- a nomination form, which includes contact information and a biography not to exceed 250 words
- a letter of nomination, which includes an overview of the person's accomplishments as they relate to the award
- two letters of support

*Timeline*

- Elissa will create and post a nomination form on various websites and mail the forms to regional centers, SELPAs, and FRCs (per May meeting notes) following November ICC meeting.
- Nominations will be due to the PAC staff person February 1, 06.
- Elissa will code the nomination forms to ensure confidentiality and mail nomination packets to PAC members by February 15, 06 for review and scoring.
- PAC members will return their rubrics by March 10, 06.
- PAC staff member will tabulate results and contact PAC members as to the top three nominees.
- Names of the top three nominees will be submitted to the Executive Committee at the March 2006 meeting.

IX. UPDATE ON *REASONS FOR CONCERN* BROCHURE:

Elissa reported that the first phase of the Reasons for Concern pilot project has been completed. Copies of the brochure, developed collaboratively by DDS and CDE, were sent to regional centers, FRCs, and SELPAs in the Far Northern, Inland, and Central Valley regional center catchments areas along with instructions for use (all agencies were contacted personally prior to sending the brochures). The next phases are to disseminate the brochure statewide beginning in January 2006; identify and disseminate statewide best practice strategies six to nine months following the pilot; and evaluate referral data, appropriateness of referral, percentage of children served, and other data points from the piloted areas.

X. Other

**Targets to Address OSEP Indicators for the State Performance Plan**

Per instructions from Rick Ingraham provided at the Executive Committee, PAC members discussed how to reach OSEP targets for Items 5&6 on the Part C Indicators—State Performance Plan worksheet as follows:

**Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National Data

**Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National Data

In addition to California's current source of data, OSEP data source requirements, and OSEP indicator requirements, two handouts, California Profile of Selected Risks Related to Early Start Program Need and Risks Related to Early Start Program Need: State Comparisons, were used to assess California's ranking on 32 OSEP indicators nationally and comparatively to New York, Florida, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

California was doing better on 20 out of 25 indicators that were scored against national percentages. Of the five remaining, California was rated the same on two indicators and three were worse (the remaining seven were not applicable). These positive results are thought to be due to numerous prevention efforts that California has engaged in over the years.

Data showed that California is doing well in the birth-12 month category for child find—California's average is .73%, while the national average is .75%. However, California was not doing as well in the birth-36 month category. In 2003, California's average was 1.85%, while the national average was 2.25%.

PAC proposed the following questions/recommendations in order to determine target criteria to include in the State Performance Plan:

- Break out the birth-3 data into 13-24 months and 25-36 months in order to better identify where the drop in referrals are.
- Break out the Reasons for Concern pilot project data into the three age ranges.
- Identify what physician/health care community training is being conducted in states with high averages.
- Conduct targeted outreach to child care, preschool, Head Start/Early Head Start, WIC, etc. in order to reach the 24-36 month age group.
- Recommend FRCs work with their local R&R agencies as an outreach strategy.
- Disseminate Reasons for Concern in First 5 New Parent Kits.
- Identify which states include 'at-risk' population in their eligibility criteria.
- What are other state's strategies for targeting the different age groups?
- Do other states break up their data into birth-12 months, 13-24 months, and 25-36 months?

APPROVED 11-17-2005

- What is the comparability among state reporting, i.e., duplicating counts?
- What other states are meeting the 2.25% criteria?

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.